LEFT AND RIGHT

AUTOMATION HYSTERIA

POWER, BLACK AND WHITE

PROPERTY, PRIVATE AND COLLECTIVE

AMERICANS: PALEFACES OR REDSKINS?

A JOURNAL OF LIBERTARIAN THOUGHT

AUTUMN 1966 VOL. 7 NO. 3 85c

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEFT AND RIGHT

A Journal Of Libertarian Thought

Editors: MURRAY N. ROTHBARD
LEONARD P. LIGGIO
H. GEORGE RESCH

CONTENTS Autumn 1966 Vol. II, No. 3

EDITORIALS
Why Be Libertarian?..... 5
The Cry for Power: Black, White, and "Polish".....11
The Martyrdom of Earl Francis.....15
Pearl Harbor: Twenty-Fifth Anniversary.....17

YALE BROZEN,
Automation: The Retreating Catastrophe.....19

ERIC DALTON,
Private Property and Collective Ownership.....33

LEONARD P. LIGGIO,
Palefaces or Redskins: A Profile of Americans.....48

Left and Right is published three times yearly (Winter, Spring, Autumn) by Left and Right, Inc., Box 395, Cathedral Station, New York, New York 10025. Subscription price: $2.50. Single issues: 85c.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITORIAL

Why Be Libertarian?

Why be libertarian, anyway? By this we mean: what's the point of the whole thing? Why engage in a deep and lifelong commitment to the principle and the goal of individual liberty? For such a commitment, in our largely unfree world, means inevitably a radical disagreement with, and alienation from, the status quo, an alienation which equally inevitably imposes many sacrifices in money and prestige. When life is short and the moment of victory far in the future, why go through all this?

Incredibly, we have found among the increasing number of libertarians in this country many people who come to a libertarian commitment from one or another extremely narrow and personal point of view. Many are irresistibly attracted to liberty as an intellectual system or as an aesthetic goal, but liberty remains for them a purely intellectual and parlor game, totally divorced from what they consider the "real" activities of their daily lives. Others are motivated to remain libertarians solely from their anticipation of their own personal financial profit. Realizing that a free market would provide far greater opportunities for able, independent men to reap entrepreneurial profits, they become and remain libertarians solely to find larger opportunities for business profit. While it is true that opportunities for profit will be far greater and more widespread in a free market and a free society, placing one's primary emphasis on this motivation for being a libertarian can only be considered grotesque. For in the often tortuous, difficult and gruelling path that must be trod before liberty can be achieved,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the libertarian's opportunities for personal profit will far more often be negative than abundant.

The consequence of the narrow and myopic vision of both the gamester and the would-be profitmaker is that neither group has the slightest interest in the work of building a libertarian movement. And yet it is only through building such a movement that liberty may ultimately be achieved. Ideas, and especially radical ideas, do not advance in the world in and by themselves, as it were in a vacuum; they can only be advanced by people, and therefore the development and advancement of such people--and therefore of a "movement"--becomes a prime task for the libertarian who is really serious about advancing his goals.

Turning from these men of narrow vision, we must also see that utilitarianism--the common ground of free-market economists--is unsatisfactory for developing a flourishing libertarian movement. While it is true and valuable to know that a free market would bring far greater abundance and a healthier economy to everyone, rich and poor alike, a critical problem is whether this knowledge is enough to bring many people to a lifelong dedication to liberty. In short, how many people will man the barricades and endure the many sacrifices that a consistent devotion to liberty entails, merely so that umpteen percent more people will have better bathtubs? Will they not rather settle for an easy life and forget the umpteen percent bathtubs? Ultimately, then, utilitarian economics, while indispensable in the developed structure of libertarian thought and action, is almost as unsatisfactory a basic groundwork for the Movement as those opportunists who simply seek a short-range profit.

It is our view that a flourishing libertarian movement, a lifelong dedication to liberty, can only be grounded on a passion for justice. Here must be the mainspring of our drive, the armor that will sustain us in all the storms ahead: not the search for a quick buck, the playing of intellectual games, or the cool calculation of general economic gains. And to have a passion for justice one must have a theory of what justice and injustice are--in short, a set of ethical principles of justice and injustice which cannot be provided by utilitarian economics. It is because we see the world reeking with injustices piled one on another to the very heavens that we are impelled to do all that we can to seek a world in which these and other injustices will be eradicated. Other traditional radical goals--such as the "abolition of poverty"--are, in contrast to this one, truly Utopian; for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man, simply by exerting his will, cannot abolish poverty. Poverty can only be abolished through the operation of certain economic factors--notably the investment of savings in capital--which can only operate by transforming nature over a long period of time. In short, man's will is here severely limited by the workings of--to use an old-fashioned but still valid term--natural law. But injustices are deeds that are inflicted by one set of men on another; they are precisely the actions of men, and hence they and their elimination are subject to man's instantaneous will.

Let us take an example: England's centuries-long occupation and brutal oppression of the Irish people. Now if, in 1900, we had looked at the state of Ireland, and we had considered the poverty of the Irish people, we would have had to say: that poverty could be improved by the English getting out and removing their land monopolies, but that the ultimate elimination of poverty in Ireland, under the best of conditions, would have to take time and be subject to the workings of economic law. But the goal of ending English oppression--that could have been done by the instantaneous action of men's will: by the English simply deciding to pull out of the country. The fact that of course such decisions do not take place instantaneously is not the point; the point is that that very failure is an injustice that has been decided upon and imposed by the perpetrators of injustice: in this case the English government. In the field of justice, man's will is all: men can move mountains, if only enough men so decide. A passion for instantaneous justice--in short, a radical passion--is therefore not Utopian, as would be a desire for the instant elimination of poverty or the instant transformation of everyone into a concert pianist. For instant justice could be achieved if enough people so willed.

A true passion for justice, then, must be radical--in short, it must at least wish to attain its goals radically and instantaneously. Leonard E. Read, President of the Foundation for Economic Education, expressed this radical spirit very aptly twenty years ago when he wrote a pamphlet, I'd Push the Button. The problem was what to do about the network of price and wage controls then being imposed on the economy by the Office of Price Administration. Most economic liberals were timidly or "realistically" advocating one or another form of gradual or staggered decontrols; at that point Mr. Read took an unequivocal and radical stand on principle: "If there were a button on this rostrum", he began his address, "the pressing of which would release all wage and price controls instantaneously, I would put my finger

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on it and push!"[1] The true test, then, of the radical spirit, is the button-pushing test: if we could push the button for instantaneous abolition of unjust invasions of liberty, would we do it? If we would not do it, we could scarcely call ourselves libertarians, and most of us would only do it if primarily guided by a passion for justice.

The genuine libertarian, then, is, in all senses of the word, an "abolitionist"; he would, if he could, abolish instantaneously all invasions of liberty: whether it be, in the original coining of the term, slavery, or it be the manifold other instances of State oppression. He would, in the words of another libertarian in a similar connection: "blister my thumb pushing that button!" The libertarian must perforce be a "button-pusher" and an "abolitionist". Powered by justice, he cannot be moved by amoral utilitarian pleas that justice not come about until the criminals are "compensated". Thus, when in the early nineteenth century, the great abolitionist movement arose, voices of moderation promptly appeared counselling that it would only be fair to abolish slavery if the slave-masters were financially compensated for their loss. In short, after centuries of oppression and exploitation, the slave-masters were supposed to be further rewarded by a handsome sum mulcted by force from the mass of innocent taxpayers! The most apt comment on this proposal was made by the English Philosophical Radical Benjamin Pearson, who remarked that "he had thought it was the slaves who should have been compensated"; clearly, such compensation could only justly have come from the slaveholders themselves.[2]

Anti-libertarians, and anti-radicals generally, characteristically make the point that such "abolitionism" is "unrealistic"; by making such a charge they are hopelessly confusing the desired goal with a strategic estimate of the probable outcome. In framing principle, it is of the utmost importance not to mix in strategic estimates with the forging of desired goals. First, one must formulate one's goals, which in this case would be the instant abolition of slavery or whatever other statist oppression we are considering. And we must first frame these goals without considering the probability of attaining them. The libertarian goals are "rea-

---

1. Leonard E. Read, I'd Push the Button (New York: Joseph D. McGuire, 1946) p. 3.
2. William D Grampp, The Manchester School of Economics (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1960), p. 59.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

listic" in the sense that they could be achieved if enough people agreed on their desirability, and that if achieved they would bring about a far better world. The "realism" of the goal can only be challenged by a critique of the goal itself, not in the problem of how to attain it. Then, after we have decided on the goal, we face the entirely separate strategic question of how to attain that goal as rapidly as possible, how to build a movement to attain it, etc. Thus, William Lloyd Garrison was not being "unrealistic" when, in the 1830's, he raised the glorious standard of immediate emancipation of the slaves. His goal was the proper one; and his strategic realism came in the fact that he did not expect his goal to be quickly reached. Or, as Garrison himself distinguished: "Urge immediate abolition as earnestly as we may, it will, alas! be gradual abolition in the end. We have never said that slavery would be overthrown by a single blow; that it ought to be, we shall always contend."[3]

Actually, in the realm of the strategic, raising the banner of pure and radical principle is generally the fastest way of arriving at radical goals. For if the pure goal is never brought to the fore, there will never be any momentum developed for driving toward it. Slavery would never have been abolished at all if the abolitionists had not raised the hue and cry thirty years earlier; and, as things came to pass, the abolition was at virtually a single blow rather than gradual or compensated.[4] But above and beyond the requirements of strategy lie the commands of justice. In his famous editorial that launched The Liberator at the beginning of 1831, William Lloyd Garrison repented his previous adoption of the doctrine of gradual abolition: "I seize this opportunity to make a full and unequivocal recantation, and thus publicly to ask pardon of my God, of my country, and of my brethren, the poor slaves, for having uttered a sentiment so full of timidity, injustice and absurdity."

3. Quoted in William H. and Jane H. Pease, eds., The Antislavery Argument (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965), p. xxxv.
4. At the conclusion of a brilliant philosophical critique of the charge of "unrealism" and its confusion of the good and the currently probable, Professor Philbrook declares: "Only one type of serious defense of a policy is open to an economist or anyone else: he must maintain that the policy is good. True 'realism' is the same thing men have always meant by wisdom: to decide the immediate in the light of the ultimate." Clarence Philbrook, "'Realism' in Policy Espousal," American Economic Review (December, 1953), p. 859.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Upon being reproached for the habitual severity and heat of his language, Garrison retorted: "I have need to be all on fire, for I have mountains of ice about me to melt." It is this spirit that must mark the man truly dedicated to the cause of liberty.[5]

5. For the quotes from Garrison, see Louis Ruchames, ed., The Abolitionists (New York: Capricorn Books, 1964), p. 31, and Fawn M. Brodie, "Who Defends the Abolitionist?", in Martin Duberman, ed., The Anti-slavery Vanguard (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 67. The Duberman work is a store-house of valuable material, including refutations of the common effort by those committed to the status quo to engage in psychological smearing of radicals in general and abolitionists in particular. See especially Martin Duberman, "The Northern Response to Slavery," in ibid., pp. 406-413.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITORIAL

The Cry For Power

Black, White, And "Polish"

In recent months, the cry of "black power!" has been heard resounding in the land. As usual, both Conservatives and Liberals have reacted violently and on the wrong side, each for their different and characteristic reasons. The Conservatives, in their mindless racism, can only react in paranoid visions of nameless "Reds" and of black violence against person and property. The more sophisticated Liberals have reacted, again typically, no more nobly and with considerably more hypocrisy. For decades, white Liberals have preened themselves as the Lords and Ladies Bountiful of the civil rights movement, uplifting their fallen brethren, financing all their causes, gently but firmly governing the Negroes in the civil rights movement and humanely pushing them around, "for their own good" of course. Now, at last, Negroes are beginning to tell the white Liberals, firmly and more or less politely, that Negroes are now prepared to stand on their own feet: that they don't need the gentle but steely bonds of dependence upon their white benefactors. Let the whites organize themselves, say the new advocates of black power; it is up to us to organize ourselves and to run our own lives.

White liberals are often thought of as well-meaning but misguided; but how well-meaning can we consider a group that reacts to this manly desire for independence with such undisguised fear and horror? The true humanitarian rejoices when the people he helps feel ready to assert their independence and to strike out

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on their own; for isn't this independence essential to being truly human? But instead of such rejoicing, the white liberals have reacted, almost to a man, with snivelling ("How can they reject us now?") and deep hostility ("How dare they be so ungrateful?"). Let us face it: the white liberals have been despotic rulers over their Negro allies. It is true that they have not ruled by coercion; but they have ruled through their financial power, and its consequent setting up of severe dependency on the part of the Negroes. In the familiar way of the worst of parents, the white liberals have ruled through dependence, money, and "love". The spurning by Negroes of parasitic white liberals has come none too soon.

There is more of significance in the sharp turn by militant Negroes from the goal of integration to that of black power. Integration was, in essence, a statist and coercive movement, for it meant forcing Negroes into areas where they could only be met with increasing hostility. Black power asks: why should I force myself into a lunch counter peopled by characters who hate me? Are they worthy to sit with me at the same counter? Black power's emphasis is not on compulsory integration but on getting the white oppressors off the backs of the Negro population. Not only is this a more profound and fundamental goal, it is also one which libertarians should be able to support wholeheartedly.

The black power concept perceives that the Negroes are, and always have been, a colonized people, in effect a colonized nation within American borders. Hence, the cry for black power is essentially a cry of black nationalism, an acknowledgment that what Negroes need most is to get the boot of the white majority off their necks. In concrete, it means a call for the end of rule over Negro areas by white police, over Negro children by white public school teachers and administrators, over the Negro poor by white welfare workers.

Many libertarians have tended to oppose any form of nationalism on the grounds that they cannot support any nation-State. But it is critically important to realize that "nationalism" cannot be lumped together in one mass. There are two contrasting types of nationalism: a desire to liberate an oppressed nation from the chains imposed by another nation (a movement for "national liberation"); as against a desire to aggress against other nations and impose one's own national domination upon them (a movement for "imperialism"). Thus, in the centuries-long struggle of the Irish people against English

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rule, the Irish movement was a movement for national liberation, the English conquest an example of English imperialism. One is a libertarian form of nationalism, the other an invasive, profoundly anti-libertarian form. A Negro nationalist movement in present-day America is a movement for national liberation; any white insistence on thwarting such a movement is an example of white imperialism. Such are the qualitative differences within the concept of nationalism.

One prominent argument to deprecate black nationalism, which has been used by every white liberal up to and including President Johnson, is that the whole movement is pure folly, since Negroes only constitute 10% of the total U. S. population. How then could such a movement possibly succeed? But this argument overlooks the crucial fact that Negroes are concentrated heavily within certain territorial areas, and that within those areas they constitute a majority. Negroes constitute a majority in much of the Black Belt of the South, and in concentrated and growing areas of the major cities of the North and West. Black nationalism could therefore conceivably be achieved for those areas. Indeed, the development by SNCC of the increasingly successful "Freedom Organization" third party in the Black Belt of Alabama, and the growing demands by the Negroes of Harlem to control their own public schools, are both part of an increasing Negro awareness that black power is feasible, in black areas. It would be almost as ludicrous to argue that Welsh nationalism could never hope to succeed because the Welsh are outnumbered by the English over the entire United Kingdom; obviously the riposte is that the Welsh enjoy superior numbers in Wales itself.

If we are to agree to the concept of "black power", then neither should we simply and brusquely dismiss as frenzied racist mobs those white rioters in the South Side of Chicago who have called desperately for "white power". A New York Times reporter of these Chicago riots noted that, in one neighborhood, the people were shouting for "Polish power", and the reporter lacked the imagination to go over and try to find out why, on the South Side of Chicago in the year 1966, there should suddenly arise the cry of "Polish power". Obviously what all this means is that the white masses of this country are beginning to wake up to the fact that despite our vaunted democracy they have no power either, that they too do not have the power to run their own lives, whether it be the Polish ethnic groups on Chicago's South Side or the white masses generally throughout the country. The black masses, realizing that they have no power, attribute that power to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"white power structure"; the white masses, resentfully realizing that they have no power, angrily attribute the trappings of rule to the Negroes or to the NAACP or to the Rev. Martin Luther King. But actually, both groups are right; neither has power over their lives; and that power belongs to a ruling oligarchy, an Establishment that is powerful, wealthy and also largely white (although a few Negroes have been co-opted into the ruling elite). Both the black and the white masses, increasingly aware of their own powerlessness, must eventually learn to identify their common oppressor and hence their common enemy: the ruling Establishment. When they learn to do so, then at last there will be a sound and sober groundwork for unity among black and white: not a misty groundwork in a mutual "love" that will not arrive short of a new Garden of Eden, but unity in a common pursuit of justice against the group that rules them both--and rules us all.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITORIAL

The Martyrdom Of Earl Francis

Above all else, Earl L. Francis cherished freedom; and to Earl Francis freedom meant working for himself, his own man on his own property. He found that freedom far from the madding crowd, high in the Catalina Mountains of Arizona; "A man can be free in the mountains," Francis used to say, "He doesn't have to punch a clock or take orders from a boss." He staked and worked a scanty gold-mining claim in those mountains, but he was able to make enough money digging the gold to build a comfortable home on the claim, a home constructed out of the granite in the mine shaft, and to spend much of his time painting canvases of his beloved mountain sunsets.

Earl Francis staked his claim in 1964 at the age of 33; but no sooner had he completed his home than the government of the United States zeroed in. He had built his home on government land, and while gold miners are allowed to build homesteads on such land, they can only do so if the gold mine is adjudged to be profitable by the standards of the U. S. government. Francis protested that the mine was profitable enough for him: "There's a few dollars' worth I can scratch out. But I like it better that way than if there was enough to make me rich. At least I don't owe nobody and nobody owes me." But such argument made no imprint on the humanitarian bureaucracy of our all-loving Welfare State. After a year and a half of gruelling litigation, Earl Francis' claim was declared null and void, and the government ordered him to leave the mine and to tear down his lovingly constructed home. Last August, Francis obeyed those

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

orders; he blew up his home and his mine and his studio with a keg of dynamite--and he blew himself up along with them.

Technically, Earl Francis' death must be marked as a suicide. But in actuality, he must be marked another lonely martyr of individualism at the hands of the burgeoning State. In effect, Earl Francis was murdered by the government of the United States of America, and it is at the very least incumbent upon every American who loves liberty to see to it that he does not go to his fiery grave unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITORIAL

PEARL HARBOR:

Twenty-Fifth Anniversary

The cataclysm of Pearl Harbor occurred twenty-five years ago, and yet the average American, bemused by official propaganda, still thinks of Pearl as an unprovoked act of Japanese aggression that took the United States and the Roosevelt Administration unawares. Yet the "revisionist" insight: that the attack was sought and welcomed, and known of in advance, by the Roosevelt Administration in order to get the U. S. into World War II, has managed, despite overwhelming odds, to make a bit of headway. For a few years after the war, the courageous and perceptive revisionist works by such historians as Beard, Sanborn, Morgenstern, and Tansill were published and won a partial hearing against the massive attempts at Establishment blackout. But these books were largely published and financed by conservatives, who in those days were doughty champions of peace and "isolationism". As the conservatives increasingly joined in and led the hoopla for a Third Great Global Crusade, however, they began to realize that a revisionist view of Pearl Harbor would prove highly embarrassing for U. S. imperialism's latest exercise in global warfare. For if revisionism teaches us anything, it teaches us the duplicity and the needlessness of the foreign wars promoted by U. S. imperialism. A new look at the myth of Pearl Harbor could not help but inspire a new look at the myths of the Cold War.

Our forthcoming, Winter, issue is devoted to taking a comprehensive new look at the Pearl Harbor catastrophe

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and at the responsibility of the American leaders. We are proud to be presenting the definitive discussion of Pearl Harbor to date, based on all the most recent findings of revisionist scholarship. As yet, there has been no one book to present the definitive history of Pearl Harbor, and until such a book is written, we believe that the forthcoming Winter issue of LEFT AND RIGHT will be able to serve as the most up-to-date presentation of historical scholarship.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AUTOMATION:

THE RETREATING CATASTROPHE

*By Yale Brozen**

Amateur social scientists such as Norbert Wiener (a professional mathematician) predicted, in 1949, that we faced "a decade or more of ruin and despair" from the wholesale unemployment which would occur in the 1950's. Cybernation and automation were going to abolish jobs at an unprecedented rate. The prediction was reaffirmed by a parade of witnesses in the mid-1950's before a Congressional committee investigating automation. Yet, the "decade or more of ruin and despair" from the unemployment that was going to be caused by automation appears to have been postponed by at least 17 years. Nevertheless, we still have doom criers who say that this consequence of automation will be appearing in the near future.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution has issued a Manifesto (March 1964) which declares that the advent of complex computers and self-regulating machines introduces an historical break in the evolution of social processes. "A new era of production has begun. Its principles of organization are as different from those of the industrial era as those of the industrial era were different from the agricultural." The new machines introduce an era of unlimited productive capacity. The new machines are displacing people in droves from manufacturing and agriculture and will soon displace them from

* Yale Brozen, an expert on the economics of automation, is professor of economics at the Graduate School School of Business, University of Chicago.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the service industries. Men cannot compete with these machines. Poverty is expanding and it has become impossible to achieve full employment.

Judgement Day is coming. Despite the fact that the predictions of its coming have been constantly disappointed, it will be upon us soon, you sinners, so repent while there is still time.

These predictions of wholesale unemployment seem to be repeated at shorter intervals as more of such predictions fail to materialize. In the late 1700's, machines such as the loom and the spinning jenny were about to bring the end of the world upon us. Edward Baines, the historian, writing in 1834, made the following comment about these predictions:

"At the accession of George III (1760), the manufacture of cotton supported hardly more than 40,000 persons; but since machines have been invented by means of which one worker can produce as much yarn as 200 or 300 persons could at that time, and one person can print as much material as could 100 persons at that time, 1,500,000 or 37 times as many as formerly can now earn their bread...

"Any yet there are still many, even scholars and members of Parliament, who are so ignorant or so blinded by prejudice as to raise a pathetic lament over the increase and spread of the manufacturing system... there are persons who regard it as a great disaster when they hear that 150,000 persons in our spinning works now produce as much yarn as could hardly be spun with the little handwheel by 40,000,000."

In the 1870's and 1880's, the spread of mechanization showed that the end was in sight. David Ames Wells, writing on Recent Economic Changes in 1889, reported that:

"The power to excavate earth, or to excavate and blast rock, is from five to ten times as great as it was when operations for the construction of the Suez Canal were commenced, in 1859-'60. The machinery sent to the Isthmus of Panama, for the excavation of the canal at that point, was computed by engineers as capable of performing the labor of half a million of men.

"The displacement of muscular labor in some of the cotton mills of the United States, within the last ten years, by improved machinery, has been from thirty-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

three to fifty percent, and the average work of one operative, working one year, in the best mills of the United States, will now, according to Mr. Atkinson, supply the annual wants of 1,600 fully clothed Chinese, or 3,000 partially clothed East Indians. In 1840 an operative in the cotton mills of Rhode Island, working thirteen to fourteen hours a day, turned off 9,600 yards of standard sheeting in a year; in 1886 the operative in the same mill made about 30,000 yards, working ten hours a day. In 1840 the wages were $176 a year; in 1886 the wages were $285 a year.

"The United States census returns for 1880 report a very large increase in the amount of coal and copper produced during the ten previous years in this country, with a very large comparative diminution in the number of hands employed in these two great mining industries; in anthracite coal the increase in the number of hands employed having been 33.2 percent, as compared with an increase of product of 82.7; while in the case of copper the ratios were 15.8 and 70.8, respectively. For such results, the use of cheaper and more powerful blasting agents (dynamite), and of the steam drill, furnish an explanation. And, in the way of further illustration, it may be stated that a carload of coal, in the principal mining districts of the United States, can now (1889) be mined, hoisted, screened, cleaned, and loaded in one half of the time that it required ten years previously.

"The report of the United States Commissioner of Labor for 1886 furnishes the following additional illutrations:

"In the manufacture of agricultural implements, six hundred men now do the work that, fifteen or twenty years ago, would have required 2,145 men-a displacement of 1,545.

"The manufacture of boots and shoes offers some very wonderful facts in this connection. In one large and long-established manufactory the proprietors testify that it would require five hundred persons, working by hand processes, to make as many womens' boots and shoes as a hundred persons now make with the aid of machinery-a displacement of eighty per cent.

"Another firm, engaged in the manufacture of children's shoes, states that the introduction of new machinery within the past thirty years has displaced about six times the amount of hand-labor required, and that the cost of the product has been reduced one half.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"On another grade of goods, the facts collected by the agents of the bureau show that one man can now do the work which twenty years ago required ten men.

"In the manufacture of flour there has been a displacement of nearly three fourths of the manual labor necessary to produce the same product. In the manufacture of furniture, from one half to three fourths only of the old number of persons is now required. In the manufacture of wallpaper, the best evidence puts the displacement in the proportion of one hundred to one. In the manufacture of metals and metallic goods, long-established firms testify that machinery has decreased manual labor 33 1/3 per cent.

"In 1845 the boot and shoe makers of Massachusetts made an average production, under the then existing conditions of manufacturing, of 1.52 pairs of boots for each working day. In 1885 each employee in the State made on an average 4.2 pairs daily, while at the present time in Lynn and Haverhill the daily average of each person is seven pairs per day, showing an increase in the power of production in forty years of four hundred per cent."

In the early 1900's electrification meant that the end was at hand. Then in the 1930's, the heavens cracked and the deluge descended because, it was said, there was too little technological change, a reversal of the earlier stand. But we are now back at the old stand again. Technology is about to engulf us. Job opportunities are about to be swallowed up, once again, by technological change, which we now call automation and cybernation.

Frankly, I am puzzled by this increasingly repeated belief in a judgement day which is constantly postponed. I am especially puzzled in view of facts which demonstrate that, if ever a judgement day threatened, it is farther in the future than ever. More jobs exist today than ever existed at any time in our history. The number of jobs has grown, not declined or even remained static. More jobs are vacant and more employers are searching for additional help than at any time in our recent history. And this is not because there is a greater gap between the skills required to fill jobs and the skills possessed by those seeking jobs. There are more people at work today filling jobs than at any time in our history. Not only are more people at work than ever, but the proportion of those aged 18 to 64 who are at work has been growing. The population in the 18 to 64 age bracket has increased at a 0.9% per year rate since 1947. Total civilian em-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ployment has increased even faster, mounting at a 1.3% per year rate since 1947. The growth rate in number of civilians employed is 40% faster than the growth rate of population in the age brackets that furnishes most of the available tenants for jobs. Yet the Ad Hoc Committee blandly states that the labor force participation rate is declining because people are losing jobs. They tell us that the unemployment figures do not tell the actual unemployment because they do not include those who have withdrawn from the market because they have found the quest for jobs to be hopeless.

Where do we find this spectre of declining job opportunities with which the doom criers are constantly trying to haunt us? The major place where we find it is among Negro teen-agers. After the statutory minimum wage rate was increased to $1.00 an hour in 1956, the unemployment rate among this group leaped to 18% of those who would like to have jobs (from a range of 7 to 13% in the preceding decade). After the statutory minimum wage was raised to $1.15 in 1961, the unemployment rate among this group jumped to 21%. With the further increase in the statutory minimum wage rate to $1.25 in 1963, the unemployment rate in this group rose further to 24%.

Now a proposal is before Congress to increase again the statutory minimum to $1.40 next year and then to $1.60 and to extend further the number of jobs covered by this wage law. We seem to be intent on forcing more and more teenagers into unemployment. We seem to be eager to foreclose the opportunities to learn a skill and become productive enough to be worth employing at wage rates well in excess of the statutory minimum in the later years of life.

A major part of our education is obtained while at work. We are foreclosing educational opportunities by these successive increases in the statutory minimum wage rate. We pushed the statutory minimum wage up by 212% from 1949 to 1963 in a period when the average wage of all employees rose less than 80%. It is no wonder that unskilled, inexperienced workers are finding it difficult to land jobs.

The inability of a major number of teen-agers to find jobs is hardly attributable to automation. The arbitrary price set by law that employers must pay must take the major share of the blame for the lack of employment opportunities for this group.

Mass unemployment, or even a minor amount of un-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

employment, has not been caused by automation. We are closer to a mass shortage of employees in the 20 to 64 year age bracket than we are to a shortage of jobs.

Since 1949, when alarms were sounded about the expected effect of automation, the number of people at work has increased by 14 million and the number of jobs by 16 million. At the same time, the average hourly compensation of factory employees has increased from $1.90 (measured in 1965 dollars) to $2.90. This is a 55% increase in real terms (i.e., measured in dollars of constant purchasing power). If the demand for employees had been depressed by automation, we would have seen a drop in the real wage, not a 55% rise, particularly in view of the rising size of the labor force.

This is not a pronouncement that no person ever lost a job because of automation. I am saying that the number of unemployed persons has not increased because of automation. Automation has created more jobs than it has destroyed. Unemployment has dropped because of it, although there are some people among the unemployed who would not have been there if there had been no automation. But there are a great many more people among those employed because of automation than are among the unemployed because of automation. Although automation has displaced some employees, the total number unemployed is smaller today than it would have been without automation, given the present wage structure.

Most of the unemployment of those 20 years of age and over is the normal unemployment that we will always have with us because of the constant shifting among jobs. People voluntarily quit jobs in very large numbers in order to seek better jobs. Normally, six million or more persons a year do this. During the period in which they are choosing among the jobs available, they are classed as unemployed and seeking work. They are not unemployed because of economic disaster, however. They are unemployed because they are taking time to canvass the market and choose among alternative openings or because they are doing some work at home and are not counted among the employed even though they are employed. If they average two months between the time they quit one job and the time they start a new one chosen from among the many openings available, the average unemployment appearing in the statistics from this one source would be over one million.

Automation does result in a redeployment of the work force. This, however, is an old story in America. A

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundred years ago, there was no automobile industry, no aircraft industry, no electric generating industry, no camera or film industry, no motor boat industry, no radio and television industry, no telephone industry, ect. Today, these are all very substantial industries employing large number of people. Without a redeployment of the work force, these industries would not be in existence. Automation-caused redeployment is simply another facet of the redeployment of labor which has been a constant fact in American life.

Why Is Automation Alarming?

In the face of this data, why do some cry that doomsday is coming? What is it about automation that causes alarm? Why is it that workers asked about their attitude toward mechanization feel no threat, yet appear frightened when asked about their feelings toward automation?

The hallmarks of automation, to distinguish it from simple mechanization or automatic methods, are its sensing, feed-back, and self-adjusting characteristics. Because it senses changing requirements and adjusts without human intervention, it presumably does away with the need for human attendants or human labor. This is very fearful indeed to those who depend upon jobs for their livelihood.

Fear of automation can be traced to four sources. One is based upon the assumption that there is a fixed amount of goods, which buyers want. Any new method which enables us to turn out more goods per man-hour will, it is believed, enable us to turn out the fixed amount of goods and services with fewer men. If a man helped by an automatic machine can produce twice as many widgets per hour as he formerly did, then, presumably, only half as many hours of work will be available for each man to do. If work weeks are not shortened, only half as many jobs could, it is asserted, be provided in these circumstances. The President of the United States used this sort of logic when he said "that approximately 1.8 million persons holding jobs are replaced every year by machines."

The second source of fear springs from the idea that automation or cybernation is something more than the latest stage in the long evolution of technology. Automation is said to be so different in degree that it is profoundly different in its effect. Automated machines controlled by computers do not simply augment muscle power as previous machines did. They replace and out-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perform human intelligence. In the future, machines will not only run machines; they will repair machines, program production, run governments and even rule men. Union leaders will collect no dues and business will have no customers because, presumably, there will be no production workers required. Human beings will, it is believed, be made as obsolete by these machines as horses were by the tractor and the automobile.

The third source of fear lies in the fact that we are much more aware of the people displaced by automation and concerned about them than we are of the other unemployed. Among the three million unemployed are several thousand persons laid off because their skills are not usable by concerns installing automated processes to replace previously used technology. Presumably, possessing only obsolete skills there are no job opportunities open to them. Others who are laid off or who are among the unemployed because they have voluntarily quit their jobs are less worrisome because their skills are not obsolete and they will have new jobs in a few weeks.

A fourth source of fear is the high incidence of joblessness among the unskilled. It is felt that the unskilled are unemployed because automated production reduces the demand for unskilled workers. Any increases in the demand for labor occurring because of automation are believed to be concentrated on highly skilled workers.

Is The Alarm Justified?

Let us analyze these presumptions which make automation so fearful to some. First, is there a fixed amount of work to be done? Does an improvement in technology which enables us to do a fixed lump of work with fewer men mean there will be fewer jobs?

In terms of a very recent type of automation, the use of electronic data processing equipment, a United States Department of Labor study of large firms which introduced such equipment concluded that: despite the reduction in labor requirements for the tasks performed by the computers, total employment of the offices as a whole rose. Over the four years from December 1953 to December 1957, total office employment at 17 offices studied increased an average of 7 percent. The experience of these offices suggests the possibility of expanding employment in new areas of office activity to handle in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formation which had previously been uneconomical to acquire.[1]

This experience of increasing office employment despite reduced labor requirements per unit of outputs is a specific instance of what has been going on generally in our economy. From 1919 to 1962, man-hours required per unit of output in the American economy dropped by 67 percent, yet total number of jobs rose from 42 million to 68 million. The tripling of output per man-hour did not reduce the number of jobs by two-thirds as those who believe in a fixed amount of work available would predict.

One group which subscribes to the fixed lump of work philosophy has pointed to the 1960-65 annual rise in output per man-hour of 3.6 percent with alarm. It has said that this exceeds the long term average annual rise of 2.4 percent from 1909 to 1963 and the average annual postwar rise of 3.0 percent. This, it has said, indicates that the pace of technological change is accelerating and will create a great unemployment problem.

The more rapid rise of output per man-hour from 1960 to 1965 was accompanied by an increase in the number of civilian jobs from 67 million to 72 million--an increase of 5 million. An even more rapid rate of increase in output per man-hour from 1949 to 1953, amounting to 4.0 percent per year, was accompanied by increase in civilian jobs from 59 million to 62 million. On the other hand, a slowed rate of increase in output per man-hour from 1953 to 1954, when output per man-hour rose by only 1.8 percent, well below the long run average rise of 2.4 percent, was accompanied by a drop in employment from 62 million to 61 million. "It is noteworthy that while many Americans worry about the loss of jobs due to technological change, the much more rapid increase in productivity abroad has been accompanied by a great reduction, not an increase, in unemployment."[2] It would seem that a more rapid rise in output per man-hour should be welcomed as a means of creating jobs more

1. U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, ADJUSTMENT TO THE INTRODUCTION OF OFFICE AUTOMATION, Bulletin NO. 1276 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960) p. 4.
2. R. N. Cooper, "International Aspects," AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE, edited by J. T. Dunlop (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962), p. 148.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rapidly than they can be destroyed by other factors at work in our economy.[3]

The primary effect of automation and increased output per man-hour is not a reduction in the number of jobs available. Rather, it makes it possible for us to do many things which otherwise could not and would not be done. Automation enables us to earn larger incomes and lead fuller lives. It will, in the future, literally make it possible to travel to the moon. It saves lives through the aid it gives doctors. By controlling traffic signals in response to traffic flows and reducing traffic congestion, it adds hours to the free time of commuters every week. It helps scientists, with the aid of high-speed data processing, to develop new knowledge that otherwise would not be available in our lifetimes. We are increasing the scale of educational activities because mechanization, automation, cybernation, or whatever we choose to call our new technology, makes it possible to do more than we could formerly. With the coming of automation, men are able to do more and have more. Both sublime and mundane activities are being enlarged and the number of jobs has grown as a consequence, not declined.

The second source of fear--the idea that automation is something more than the latest stage in the long evolution of technology--the idea that it is so different in degree that it is profoundly different in effect--is an equally specious hobgoblin. The first thing to be said is that automation is not a new phenomenon.

Although we may grant that automation differs from other kinds of technology, we should not blind ourselves to history to the point of saying it is completely new. Perhaps the earliest automated device was the pressure cooker invented by Denis Papin in 1680. He originated a pressure control which is still one of the most widely used regulators. Despite this automated device, and others

---

3. A study by S. Fabricant for the pre-war period found that "trends in unit labor requirements have been negatively correlated with trends in man-hour employment in different industries" (that is, decreases in hours of labor per unit of product--increases in output per man-hour--have been correlated with increased employment while increases in hours of labor per unit of proudct have been correlated with a decline in employment). EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, 1899-1939 (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1942).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such as thermostatic oven controls, cooks are still extensively employed and housewives still find it necessary to devote time to their kitchen work. Although homemakers may spend less time in the kitchen, this has simply freed them to do more of other kinds of work, such as better educating their children and decorating their homes.

During the eighteenth century, several types of automatic regulators were applied to windmills. An automatic, card-programmed loom was devised by Jacquard over 150 years ago. An automatic flour mill was built in 1741. Eighteenth century steam engines were controlled by governors which had sensing, feed-back, and resetting characteristics which are the hallmark of automation. Automation has been increasingly applied over the last two centuries, yet employment has risen continually.

If automation is so remarkably different in degree than previous technological change, it should show in the data on productivity. I have said above that output per man-hour has risen in the last five years at a 3.6% annual rate. If automation is doing such profoundly different things to us, that rate, then, should be a markedly higher rate of increase than ever before experienced. Yet, in contrast, output per man-hour in manufacturing in the post World War I decade rose at a 5.0% per year rate--a rate which has not been matched in any ten year period you want to pick since World War II. If automation is such a profound leap in technology, it has yet to manifest itself as such in economically significant terms.

As to the third source of fear--the fear that our skills will be made obsolete much more rapidly because of automation and we will lose our jobs for that reason and, with obsolete skills, be unable to find any other job--there is simply no evidence that workers are becoming unemployed in greater numbers for this reason and are unable to find other jobs because their skills are obsolete. The only group which has suffered a significant increase in the incidence of unemployment are teen-agers seeking their first job. I have already indicated that this is a consequence of man-made legislation--the stupendous increase in the minimum wage rates set by statutes passed by Congress and state legislatures.

When skill requirements on jobs change, most of the affected employees are retrained by their employers for new jobs. The average production worker in General Motors is retrained six times in ten years. The average

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

airline spends $100,000 per pilot over a pilot's career retraining him for flying new aircraft as old aircraft are phased out and replaced. Industry in general is spending well over $20 billion a year on employee training and retraining.

The U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics studied the experience of twenty major firms converting to electronic accounting and found that only one employee of the 2,800 employees involved was laid off. In seven companies installing automation equipment which were intensively studied by the Stanford Research Institute, not one employee was laid off. When the South Chicago Works of U. S. Steel was replaced by an automated mill, of the 1,346 employees involved, only one was laid off.

Automation has resulted in the re-deployment of the work force--not in discarding obsolete men for whom there is no further use. I said earlier that this is an old story. The extent of the redeployment which has occurred may startle many readers.

Only a century ago, fifty out of every one hundred workers toiled on farms producing the nation's supply of food and fiber. Only two or three out of every one hundred workers were producing educational, medical, recreational, and other services which contribute to a richer, fuller, healthier life. Today, the number of workers in these life-enriching occupations is relatively five times as great. Those toiling on farms have been reduced to one-seventh their former number. They now direct machines instead of using animal power and their own muscles. The quality of life has been improved and brute toil has been reduced because technology has increased our incomes to the point where we can afford these services and these machines.

Most of this redeployment occurred before we ever heard of automation, much less had any effects produced by it.

The fourth source of fear of automation apparently springs from the high incidence of joblessness among the unskilled. Some of the doom criers tell us the unskilled are unemployed because automation has reduced the demand for unskilled workers even though it may, in some instances they grudgingly admit, increase the demand for skilled workers.

If the unskilled were the victims of automation, we should expect a steadily growing volume of unemployed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among the unskilled as the economy becomes increasingly automated. Instead, we find, for example, that the age group 14 to 17 "had particularly severe declines (in employment) from 1950 to 1951, 1955 through 1957, and 1960 to 1961. These declines in employment for this group coincide with Federal increases in minimum wages and the extension of coverage." After the surge in teen-age unemployment coinciding with the last increase in the minimum wage rate in 1963, the unemployment rate has started dropping. If we believe that automation causes unemployment among the unskilled, the unemployment rate in this group should have continued to rise.

There is abundant evidence that the increased unemployment among the unskilled is a result of the rise in the statutory minimum wage rate and extension of the number of jobs covered by the statutory minimum. There is now a large literature which displays the data establishing this fact.

The evidence available concerning the effects of automation leads to these conclusions:

1. If no technological change had occurred in the past decade, the number of civilian jobs available and occupied could have grown as it has from 63 million to 72 million only at the price of restricting increases in wage rates.

2. The technological change of the last decade has increased the average employee's earnings by $400 per year compared to what they would be if there had been no automation.

3. Automation increased the number of jobs available at the 1955 wage level by 20 million. Since only 9 million additional people have joined the work force and become available to fill jobs, there would be a shortage of 11 million workers today if wage rates had not increased. The increase in wage rates has reduced the demand for labor to the point where there are few shortages of most types of labor.

4. The overly large increase in the wage rate for the unskilled as a result of minimum wage legislation, has destroyed so many jobs for these people that we have a surplus of unskilled teen-agers for filling unskilled jobs in some sections of the country. This surplus is not a result of automation but of over-pricing.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

5. Automation and other forces such as the growth in the stock of capital are doing a major job in alleviating poverty. If we define poverty in terms of a $3000 per year family income measured in 1962 dollars, the incidence of poverty has fallen from 32% of all family units in 1947 to 18% in 1964 and to approximately 15% today. The declarations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution that there is an increasingly large disadvantaged group in our society, that there is a growing permanently depressed class, and that poverty is worsening simply do not square with the facts.

6. Instead of being alarmed about growing automation, we ought to be cheering it on. The catastrophe that doom criers constantly threaten us with has retreated into such a dim future that we simply cannot take their pronouncements seriously.

Let us have more automation, more mechanical slaves to work for us, and stop wasting our time and dwelling on the threat of hobgoblins which exist only in the imaginations of those who refuse to look about them at what is going on in the economy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Private Property And Collective Ownership

*By Eric Dalton**

Philosophy has fathered a number of other sciences. It is, as we all know, the father of physics which used to be known as natural philosophy. And no one is ignorant of the fact that economics was launched by a moralist whose name was Adam Smith. Nor should this be really surprising when we reflect on the fact that the most general notions in all these sciences are basically philosophical and that the methods of unfolding their implications are basically philosophical. There is, of course, the problem of determining whether there is any thing in reality which corresponds to the notions whose depths we attempt to plumb. In general the answer to this problem is not given to us by philosophical methods; it is given to us by observation.

How then does philosophy differ from the other sciences? No hard and fast line can be drawn between them. Both the scientist and the philosopher analyze concepts. Both of them engage in observations. But the people called philosophers have usually begun the analysis of the concepts and have made the most general observations. Others continue where they leave off. These we may call the scientists. They prolong the work which was begun to the philosopher, leaving him to open up new areas which are in their turn to be handed over to future scientists for further refinement.

Consider the idea of free exchange. We can analyze this notion and work out all of its logical implications.

---

* Eric Dalton is the nom de plume of a professor of philosophy at a major American university.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We can also concern ourselves with finding out whether there is such a thing as free exchange in reality and to what extent. Now let us ask ourselves whether this notion is proper to philosophy or to economics. In vacuo there really is no way of answering the question. In the abstract it is no more the one than the other. We may note, however, that the full working out of the idea and its application has been achieved by a group of people known as economists. And we could therefore define an economist as one who has developed this and other more or less closely related ideas.

There is an enormous quantity of metaphysics in Newton's Principia just as there is an enormous quantity of science in Aristotle's Physics. It is, therefore, simplistic to speak of the one as being a philosopher and the other as being a scientist. It is rather a question of more or less. We can say that Newton belonged to the class of those who pushed a certain line of inquiry to an extraordinary degree and that there are enough of such people to enable us to speak of a class of physicists.

So, perhaps, we should not ask whether so and so is talking philosophy or economics. About all we can say is that he has gone further into a certain type of question than most people called philosophers care to go. If he does a bad job we tend to say he is out of his field; it would probably be better simply to say that he is out of his depth. But we should not say: "He is out of his depth. Therefore, he did a bad job." Rather we should say: "He did a bad job; therefore, he is out of his depth."

If all this begins to look like an apology for what I am going to discuss this will be because it is. Had I not written this preface the reader would be tempted to wonder whether I, a philosopher, was doing philosophy or economics. I trust that this question will now seem a less interesting one. I propose to attempt a justification of private ownership and then to analyze the term "collective ownership". I hope to show that this latter term is without any meaning. Unfortunately, it is often assumed to have meaning and the existence of such a thing in reality is frequently taken for granted even by would-be defenders of individual ownership. I shall conclude by pointing up a number of cases where this occurs - to the great detriment of economic debate.

Self-Ownership And Property Right

We shall begin by stating our fundamental thesis concerning private property. Any man has the right to ac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quire previously unowned goods, keep or give them away at his pleasure, use or not use them at his pleasure. We shall now attempt to justify this proposition.

Lest there be any confusion, it would be well to define exactly the manner in which we are employing the term "right". When we say that one has the right to do certain things we mean this and only this, that it would be immoral for another, alone or in combination, to stop him from doing this by the use of physical force or the threat thereof. We do not mean that any use a man makes of his property within the limits set forth is necessarily a moral use. We do not deny, therefore, that one may in many instances have an obligation to share his property with various of his fellows. It does not follow that one may with propriety produce and sell addictive drugs to whomsoever desires them. What is wrong, however, is the use of physical force to stop these things from happening.

We mention this to point up the fact that we do not give automatic approval to whatever occurs on the free market. Not only this, but the market itself provides suitable punishments to what we may regard as undesirable forms of conduct. As an example, let us mention the "Legion of Decency". In the early thirties there was widespread disapproval of many of the films being turned out in Hollywood. The Legion was extremely active in organizing a boycott of such films. Now whether we approve of the particular effort or not, we should note that it did not rely on physical force and that it was effective to a considerable degree. It relied on voluntary activity and relied entirely on the right of free speech. There is also the old remedy of the raised eyebrow. Most of us do not like to be known as skinflints; on the contrary, we like to be known as great benefactors of mankind and some of us even want to be that way. Doubtless factors such as these had considerable influence on much of the philanthropy during this and the last century. We may say that a man's right to property tells us not so much what he may properly do but rather what others may not properly do to him. It is fundamentally a right not to be interfered with.

We may now ask ourselves on what this right rests. It derives, we would say, from the prior right of self-ownership. Each of us owns himself and his activities. This means that we may not initiate violence against others. We say "initiate" because we may certainly employ violence against those who have initiated it against us. In other words, we may repel violence. Now let us suppose that in various manners I deploy my activity

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon material non-human goods that are previously unowned. By what right does anyone stop me? There are but two possible justifications: either he has the right to direct my activities by using violence (in other words he owns me) or else he owns the material goods in question. But this contradicts the assumptions we have already made: that each human being is self-owned and that the material goods in question are not previously owned. This man is claiming either to own me or the property I think I have acquired. The only factor open to question is whether the other man had peacefully acquired the land before me. But to raise this question is to concede the right of private property which is the thing we are trying to establish. Now, if no one man has the right to do this, it follows that no greater number may do so, for the same question that was asked of A may be asked concerning C, and so of all the others. Surely, if this is true of any of them taken singly, there is no reason to suppose that they could properly do this if they banded together.

There is, then, an unlimited right of acquisition. This applies, however only to what others have not already acquired. This sounds obvious, but apparently it is not for many. One frequently hears the claim that there should be a redistribution of property on the grounds that its present division does not enable everyone to be a landowner and each one has the right to be a property owner. The equivocation should be clear: each one has the right to appropriate what no one else has appropriated. The right to appropriate is without content unless he who does so may keep what he has taken. And if one may keep what has been taken, it follows that nobody has the authority to wrest it from him.

The right of self-ownership implies the right to give away property either gratis or in exchange for something else. By what right could one force an individual to retain ownership of his property? Likewise, if an individual may give away his property then by the same token a person may receive it. One is the corollary of the other. All the objection to inherited wealth is an attack on the right of a man to give away his property. Where do we derive the authority to force a man to give his property to the individuals whom we designate? Surely their income is just as much unearned as the one to whom the original owner desires to bequeath his goods.

There appears to be an extremely powerful prejudice against unearned wealth. But it is as selective as it is powerful. The "liberals" object to it when the recipients are wealthy and favor it when they are poor. Some "con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

servatives" select in the opposite direction. These latter will object to the guaranteed annual income on the grounds that it is unearned by the recipient and it removes from him the stimulus to produce. Neither of these reasons is valid. The mere fact that an income is unearned is totally irrelevant and although the fact that a person is not productive is bad for the rest of us, we do not have the authority to force him to be productive. The true answer to the advocates of such subsidies is that they involve stealing from legitimate owners. This has nothing to do with whether we favor the "Protestant Ethic". By using this type of argument "conservatives" fall into the hands of their opponents, who have a field day in raising all manner of difficulties against that ethic. The unearned income of the rich is justified because it belongs to them; whereas that of the man on government relief is not because it is stolen from its rightful owner. It is certainly proper to point out to those who favor such measures that most of the people whom this kind of income would motivate not to produce would eventually become poorer than they already are - this because they are unaware of long-range economic efforts. But the primary issue still remains ethical. Suppose that even without welfare payments the leisure preferences of most people increased enormously. All of us would then be poorer because of their failure to produce. But this fact would not justify our forcing them to produce. The only legitimate alternative would be for us to move elsewhere.

Man also has the right to use or not to use his property as he sees fit. By use we mean any alteration in the physical constitution of the thing owned. Once the property has been appropriated the owner may either leave it alone or alter it in any manner whatsoever. Many object to the continued ownership of "unimproved" land on the grounds that the owner has done nothing to increase its value. Were he later to sell it he would be obtaining something without any effort on his part. Here again is implicit the fallacy that gain is justified only to the extent that it is the result of previous misery - a doctrine that Marx and others inherited from the Schoolmen. But more basically, it relies on a totally false supposition: that by transforming an object we can increase its value. There is no such thing as value in the object. Objects are valued by people: what is valued by people is the physical reality. People do not value values! The only way to increase another's valuation of what I have is by hypnotism.

True, we may so change the physical constitution of objects that they correspond to the future values of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people. But note that there is no absolute certainty as to what their values will be. It may very well be the case that what people will value will be the object in its original form. If this happens then all my efforts will have been in vain. I then would have benefitted him and myself far more by doing nothing. In other words, the owner of property performs an entrepreneurial function. He must predict the future valuations that he and others will make and act or not act accordingly. He is "rewarded" primarily, not for his work, but for his good judgment.

This is a simple lesson the learning of which would have spared the world a tremendous amount of misery. Unfortunately the world seems as far from accepting it as always. The view that one should be rewarded for one's efforts is part of the Conventional Wisdom and one finds it on the tongue of both the liberal and the conservative. One of the reasons why Marxism always finds such a ready ear is the fact that before hearing about it people already hold its basic theory of value. And it is an easy matter for the Marxist to show such a person that the way in which wages are paid accords very poorly with commonly accepted ideas of justice. Far from retarding the acceptance of Socialistic ideas his religious convictions will tend to accelerate the process. Witness the numbers of clergymen who have been caught in this trap.

Justice And Property In Land

So much, then, for the basic principles connected with the notion of private property. The sad reality of England at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century was rather difficult from the ideal situation. Undoubtedly the extent of the misery that prevailed after the introduction of more or less free economies has been grossly exaggerated. Indeed there would have been even greater misery had this system not been introduced. This leads us to believe that there was something radically wrong before the change that has never been given the proper attention. While most of the frightful restrictions on economic action were removed, the enormous feudal land-holdings were left untouched in the name of respect for private property.

As we know these holdings were mostly the result either of conquest or state land-grants. It is highly dubious that these holdings could ever have attained their size on the free market. Justice would have dictated the division of these lands among the agricultural workers. Unfortunately this was not done. The result was that a few individuals had votes in the market far beyond their due and were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thereby enabled to determine the course of events. These were responsible for the spectacular amount of investment and consequent economic growth of the area. There is no doubt that we have more goods at our disposal now because of what happened then.

Suppose the land had been divided up. Probably agriculture would have been a much more important industry in England. It is also likely that the rate of consumption would have been higher. This would have meant less investment, less "growth". We would not be where we are today. Supposing all this to be true, what of it? The primary question is the one of justice. Where does a man get the authority to require that some one else use his property in the manner that the outsider judges to be the most economic? It is his property and he has the right to use it in the way which satisfies him. If he does not want to "grow" that is his business.

The fact that a future generation may be better off because of a forced rate of growth during the previous generations excuses nothing. This would be tantamount to allowing future generations to impose taxes on their ancestors. The forced abstinence from consumption is constantly being justified on the grounds that "we will be better off in a hundred years". Just who is "we"? In a hundred years we will all be dead. Even if we were not, suppose we want to be better off now. Should not individuals be allowed to function in accordance with their own time-preferences?

The unwillingness of some to remedy an unjust distribution of holdings on the ground that to do so would be uneconomic is positively scandalous. After all, if not to remedy such an iniquitous distribution is justifiable in the name of economics, then would it not also be legitimate to create an unjust system for the same reason? Why not seize small holdings and give them to those men who would choose to save rather than to consume? But this would be unjust. True, but so it is if people are allowed to retain holdings that really do not belong to them.

We can go further, however, and challenge the thesis that the system of holdings that obtained at the time the free-market was instituted was the most economic one. How can anyone tell? On the supposition that a free market had obtained from the beginning we can say that the distribution of wealth is the most economic one. The size of anyone's holdings will tend to reflect the extent to which he satisfied the desires of those with whom he engaged in business. Since, ex hypothesi, there never was coercion everybody benefitted by the exchanges. Certain-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly no such claims can be made in behalf of a system that preexisted the unhampered market. All we can say is that if the holdings are left untouched and if free exchange is introduced, then eventually a satisfactory system will develop. Here, however, the long run may be long indeed, and what about the rights of the people in the meanwhile? They will prefer to consume the smaller pie that is theirs by rights. That people who possess what is rightfully yours are busy making a larger pie which can be consumed only by your descendants is cold comfort indeed.

These considerations surely raise numerous questions about the situations in the undeveloped areas of the world. Obviously one of the big problems is what to do with the vast holdings of land. There is little doubt that these were not acquired by legitimate means. Because these exist large numbers of individuals are doomed to a life of misery even by their own standards. One can sympathize with the misguided concern of the Marxist reformer. On the other hand, we must deplore his forked-tongued approach to the propaganda problem. Interestingly he will appeal to the peasant by his proposals to divide the land--an effective appeal because by instinct the peasant firmly believes in private property and feels he has been defrauded of it. To the factory workers, however, he has an entirely different story to tell. He gives them to understand that the capitalistic mentality of the peasant is his real enemy and promises that the land will be taken over by the state, so that the kulaks will not be able to charge the workers in the city exorbitant prices.

Anybody who understands the workings of the free market can see that the policies advocated by collectivists are doomed to failure. For the most part, however, those who pay lip-service to the market show little desire to question the property arrangements in these areas. This is why they have little to say that would interest the poor and downtrodden in these countries. These people have therefore come to associate the free market system with approval of the status quo. They would not be greatly helped by the fact that from now on their oppressors would be able to exchange with each other on an unhampered basis. All this means is that for the foreseeable future a few more crumbs might fall from the tables of those who profit by facilitated exchange.

Here again the spirit of growthmanship is operative. "These countries will never become industrialized unless the vast holdings are allowed to continue and the land will not be well used if divided up." Could a Marxist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be more critical of the free market than these people? Is it not the right of the real owners to decide to what extent their area shall be industrialized?

Also operative are certain special interests who want justice here but not abroad. Some of them have bought land from people who had no right to it in the first place; others have been given land by governments who had previously expropriated it. This makes them a party to the injustice. Obviously much of the justifiable complaining in these areas is misdirected. Just as these foreign companies will object to any expropriation by appealing to the sanctity of property, so the natives will blame their troubles on the system of private property itself, or they will attack foreign investment as something which is evil in itself. As in so many instances people are unable to locate their real enemy. Surely if these people do blame their troubles on free enterprise, the defenders of this system are partly responsible for their error.

We have given a general analysis of what is involved in the notion of private, individual property. We have attempted to show that this system is justified by the more basic right of self-ownership. We then pointed out that the only ground on which others could prevent a person from acquiring ownership is an implicit claim to previous ownership by somebody else. But to concede that somebody else owned the property is to admit that there is such a thing as the right to property. Then we established that no one has the authority to interfere with the non-aggressive use of that property. It is finally important to realize that goods that have been illegitimately acquired do not become lawful property by virtue of the mere passing of time.

"Society" And Collective Ownership

We have put off until now reckoning with one final notion: that the goods of the earth belong to no individuals, but rather are vested in an entity called "society". Somehow, this entity is a whole of which each one is a part. It is conceived as having rights and also duties. The actions of the parts may be permitted only to the extent to which they aid the whole. The organ through which society expresses itself can be either a king, a parliament, or simply the majority of its members. Supposedly, whatever these organs want "we" want. Pervasive as it is, this theory is quite difficult to formulate, and for good reason. It is often enough used as the ultimate justification of government.

The question we should ask is not so much whether society has the rights attributed to it as whether such an entity can be meaningfully said to exist at all. When,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

however, you ask what kind of entity this could possibly be you are referred to various analogies. Just as we are made up of cells so society is made up of individuals. "If you claim that the notion of 'society' is unintelligible, you must also claim that the notion of a whole is meaningless." It is, indeed, difficult to admit that the one could exist and not the other. If, therefore, the notion of "society" derives its plausibility from these analogies it might pay us to inquire a bit into them. Are there really, anywhere, entities that are made up of entities, or are we the victims of a linguistic trick? If nowhere are such entities to be found, then automatically this notion of "society" will fall to the ground.

Perhaps the best approach to the matter would be through an examination of what is meant by a collective noun. As an example, let us take "baseball team". We use this term to designate many things that are united in some particular respect. In the case at hand each man acts in conjunction with others in order to bring about a certain pattern of activities. Do we literally have a new being which did not exist before these people joined forces? Certainly not. We do as a matter of fact speak as if there were now a single entity, we use the word "team" as the subject of a sentence, we replace the word "team" by "it". But we are conscious that in so doing we are simply using a convenient manner of speaking which is designed to save time. The proof of this is that we could simply eliminate the word "team" from our language and substitute a more prolix language that referred to "those men who are united for the purpose of playing baseball". This is quite a complicated formula and it is well we have discovered more convenient fashions of expressing ourselves. Nor does this cause any problem as long as we realize exactly what we are doing.

Note that in the example given there is no "Ego" over and above that of the individuals who have pooled their activities. Nor, strictly speaking, is there a collective activity; there are only individual activities directed by individual persons towards a mutually agreed upon end. The "whole" is nothing but the individual players insofar as they cooperate. The only real entities are the individuals or the "parts". This suggests that we could in principle eliminate "whole" sentences from our language and replace them by more complicated sentences whose subject is "parts" or "individuals".

In what sense can we speak of these organizations or societies as owning property? These groups vary considerably from one another but there are a few general

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remarks that should apply to all. The first thing to realize is that no matter what else may be true of the arrangements, these groups own what they do because of the free choice of the individuals who have entered into this type of cooperation. Indeed, the very existence of the organization presupposes the willingness of individuals to join together and its continuance requires new decisions on the part of those willing to collaborate with the already existing members. It is certain that the organization cannot have preceded its first members. The financial arrangements will be those decided upon by the original members, for even if changes are later to be made, the procedure for introducing them will have been set up by the founders. So, from first to last the societal ownership is ultimately that of its individual members.

Let us now return to the contention that the original owner of the property is not the individual but "Society". We have seen that the only real entities are individuals, so that nothing can be true of a society which is not true of the individuals that make it up. Consider first the ownership of the individuals. In so doing we shall suppose a society made up of two individuals A and B. There are but two possibilities: A owns A, B owns B; or A owns B or B owns A. There is no third entity that can own them both. But there must be a third if both of them are to be owned; that is, for them to belong in the literal sense to Society. If we suppose that A owns B or the opposite, we still do not have societal ownership but individual ownership. Now since the appropriation of non-human goods can only take place via the activities of people, it follows that what is appropriated by the individuals will belong to the owners of the individuals. Since it is impossible that Society own the individuals, it cannot own what they appropriate.

It is true that the two members of our little society can agree jointly to appropriate land of which they will be co-owners. But in this case the initial decision is entirely voluntary, and each one is an individual part-owner of that property and may abandon his share of ownership at his own pleasure.

Thus we see that the thesis that Society is the original owner of land cannot stand up under analysis. This is not simply a question of historical fact. In the very nature of the case, the individual precedes society and this includes the ownership of the individual. All the rest must be the result of contractual relationships, itself dependent on the free decisions of individuals.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Though the concept that there are goods that belong to Society is unacceptable, there are many occasions where it is taken for granted that Society is an entity in its own right and that it automatically does own things. This constitutes the unspoken major premise of many political proposals. We would like briefly to examine a number of cases where this assumption is made.

"It is necessary to conserve Society's valuable resources." This is the famous problem of waste. As we have already seen, these resources are either unowned or else their ownership is distributed among various individuals. There is no third possibility. The first alternative presents little difficulty. How come nobody owns these resources? Surely if it were in the interest to the economy various individuals would be appropriating such resources. Why do they fail to do so? Why is it not to their interest to acquire them? The fundamental reason appears to be the fact that such goods are not sufficiently scarce to justify the cost (and there is such) of appropriating them. In other words the very fact that there are goods which no one sees fit to acquire for his exclusive use is of itself a sign that no problem exists concerning their conservation. Surely, if there were, some entrepreneurs would notice the fact and do something about it. It is surely suspicious when the only one who can see that it is worthwhile to acquire resources is the government.

The other possibility is that the resources are already distributed among individual owners. In which case the only ones who have the right to speak about wasting "our" resources are the owners themselves. Each owner will make use of his resources in the way he sees fit. He can be said to have wasted his resources only when he makes mistaken predictions, and the more resources he has the ability to acquire the less likely he is to be the kind of person who makes the wrong predictions. The same may be said concerning those who make eccentric use of their resources, e.g., setting their oil fields afire in order to produce spectacles. Here we cannot say that the man is wasting something. He may be so constituted that he gets more satisfaction out of doing this than from other uses to which he might put his property. All we can say is that in a free society people of this type are unable to acquire any considerable amount of property unless someone makes a gift of it to them. In an unhampered market the entire tendency is that one may grow wealthy only by serving in large measure the interest of his fellows. If the wealth were given to someone of this nature, again, he would not be able for any length of time to preserve his position. So we can say that full freedom to perform

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

non-aggressive actions tends to prevent any large scale use of resources that is not mutually beneficial. Not only is it meaningless to speak of Society's resources; it is not even helpful.

"Our country is importing too much." Here is another statement which, given a free society, is without content. Countries do not import. Only people do. How can an individual import too much except by failing properly to predict his future wants? If he is that poor a guesser he will not be around for long, and the less wealthy he is the more quickly he will cease importing. In any area some people will import a great deal, others much less, but no one can go on importing too much for his good for any length of time. But perhaps some people are importing too much for the good of others in the sense that they are failing to help the others. We must note, first of all, that a person's importing is not the reason why those around him are not helped. Suppose he were to cease importing and not buy the goods from those near him. Are they any better off because he stopped importing? We may also add that to the extent that the importer has wide relationships with those near him, his imports from elsewhere will positively benefit them because these extensive relationships can continue only because what he imports is of greater benefit to them. Obviously, the fewer economic ties he has with his neighbors, the less they will be helped by his imports. But then to complain about this is to stake a claim to the effect that simply because X lives within a certain radius of Y, he should be forced to help Y.

One of the common complaints against an unmanaged currency is that the people are unable to control their money. The ambiguity lies in the expression "the peoples' money". Does it mean that there is collective ownership of the medium of exchange? If so, the phrase is unintelligible. Given the free economy each individual owns whatever money he is able to acquire. He values it as he sees fit, controls it as he sees fit, and manages it as he sees fit. The people control their money in the same way they control their television sets. Of course, the last thing that advocates of government planning want is for people to have control of their money. What they want is for the government to control it. What they mean by "uncontrolled" is precisely that it is controlled but not by those whom they would like to see control it. One of the great problems of the world is the fact that money is not controlled by its rightful owners.

Then there is the old chestnut that has it that our country is losing gold. Supposing that each individual owns what-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever gold he has, it is obviously impossible for a country to lose gold. It doesn't have it in the first place. Only the individuals who have the gold can lose it - not a very likely contingency. Normally people do not lose gold. They exchange it for things that they would rather have. We would be somewhat astonished to hear someone maintain in all seriousness that he "lost" two dollars because he went to the movies. The real truth behind such claims is that the government which has expropriated the peoples' gold is being called upon by other governments to redeem its currency. But this would never have happened had not the government engaged in an inflationary policy.

I will end with a particularly weird example from Robert Heilbroner's The Making of Economic Society, pp. 96-97:

> "Yet England experienced difficulties enough in launching the Great Transformation. As we can now see, many of these difficulties were the direct consequences of the problems which our model highlighted for us. The industrialization process of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries did, indeed, necessitate a great amount of saving - that is, of the releasing of consumption - and much of the social hardship of the time can be traced to this source.
>
> For who did the saving? Who abstained from consumption? The manufacturers themselves (for all their ostentatious ways) were among those who plowed back a substantial portion of their profits into more investment. Yet the real savers were not the manufacturers so much as another class - the industrial workers. Here, in the low level of industrial wages, the great sacrifice was made - not voluntarily, by any matter of means, but made just the same. From the resources they could have consumed was built the industrial foundation for the future."

We have already referred to what we believe were the great injustices of the period of the "Great Transformation". Had there been a more equal distribution of property individuals would have been consuming more of what they produced, simply because each of them would have been producing a smaller quantity and, therefore, a lesser tendency to save. Since Heilbroner's reasoning does not depend on any prior unjust distribution of property, let us take for granted the justice of the arrangement and see if his analysis makes any sense.

It is true that non-consumption is a necessary condition for saving. But the non-consumption in question

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concerns one's own resources, not those of other people. I can hardly be said to be saving for you when I fail to consume your resources. This is not the place to discuss the problem of wages. Suffice it to say that had less been produced real wages would not have been as high as they were at any given time. The increased production was mutually beneficial to the owners and the workers. The fact that the owners saved rather than consumed made the workers' condition far better than otherwise. They were perhaps victimized by the fact that the producers had the money that rightly belonged to them. But not by the fact that the money was saved. It is absolutely ridiculous to assert that the workers actually did the saving for they did not have the resources to save. Even if someone takes my money away from me and saves it, it is hardly enlightening for me to claim that I am doing the saving. It is only because he indulges in this type of collective thinking that Heilbroner was able to write such nonsense. Its plausibility can only rest on the analogy of a family where some members, anxious to increase the total wealth, deliberately abstain from consuming their earnings in order to contribute them to the investments of the more productive individuals of the group.

In the next paragraph we are told that "England had to hold down the level of its working class consumption in order to free its productive effort for the accumulation of capital goods." What on earth is the entity that ever made such a decision? Practically the only entities making decisions in nineteenth century England were those who owned resources. There were many decisions on the part of many people, but none by England. And I am quite sure that no one thought himself capable of "holding down the consumption of the working class" or desired to do so "in order to free its productive effort for the accumulation of capital goods". Decisions of this kind are made today, however. But they are made, not by property owners, but by dictators.

If there is a lesson to be learned from this paper it is that the only enlightening way of analyzing economic and property problems is by always returning to the individual who, alone, is real. People are ill served by the manufacture of spurious entities.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Palefaces Or Redskins:

A Profile Of Americans

By Leonard P. Liggio

> On the same day that tropical Pearl Harbor stood in flames, in the other part of the world in a snowstorm Russian divisions were first driving back the Germans from their advanced outposts near Moscow. ....7 December 1941 was the turning point of the Second World War. From that day onward the defeat of Germany, Italy, and Japan was assured.[1]

John Lukacs indicates that the roots of the Cold War are to be found in the beginnings of World War II. Lukacs analyzes how Pearl Harbor resulted from the policy decisions of particular forces in the governments of Washington and Tokyo. Roosevelt's demands on behalf of the US puppet Chiang prevented peaceful relations from prevailing between US imperialism and the Asian national bourgeoisie, for whom Japan had been the traditional spokesman. As a result of the United States' provocative embargo on trade with Japan and its refusal to negotiate in good faith, the nationalist militarists in Japan became predominant over the peaceful traditional and business interests. Lukacs sketches the final efforts by the Japanese to gain US agreement to peace in the Far East, and indicates the central role of Chiang's China Lobby in involving the American people in an Asian conflict which has lasted for the past twenty-five years.

> There is no doubt that the Japanese Emperor and at least part of the Tokyo government really wished to

---

1. John Lukacs, A New History of the Cold War (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1966), pp. 36-37

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

avoid war with the United States in 1941. Even though Roosevelt refused to meet Prince Konoye in Honolulu earlier, around 20 November the situation was such that a possibility for a compromise was discernible from the text of a so-called Japanese "Proposal B" that was not too far apart from an American modus vivendi proposal already drafted. But between 22 and 25 November it was decided in Washington not to present the modus vivendi to the Japanese; and the American note handed to them on 26 November contained conditions that, though excellent in principle, the Japanese government could hardly accept. ...The motives behind this American diplomatic reversal are still somewhat obscure. We know that Chiang's friends, allies, lobbyists, and agents played a very important role.[2]

American intervention in World War II on the side of Chiang had a profound effect on American foreign policy attitudes, particularly upon Isolationism, as noted in Lukacs' analysis of the development of the Cold War. Lukacs says:

> Obviously Isolationism ceased to be respectable after Pearl Harbor. ...Yet, again, we may ask whether this development has been profound rather than superficial and even whether it has been so clear a gain at all?[3]

Lukacs then quotes President De Gaulle's views on the manner in which the undercutting of American isolationism contributed to the origins and maintenance of the Cold War. Lukacs suggests that of all who have written about American foreign policy from World War II "there is but one who saw through Roosevelt's global plans with profound insight. It is General De Gaulle" in his War Memoirs.[4] De Gaulle declared:

> a kind of messianic impulse now swelled the American spirit ...which concealed the instinct for domination.... It was true that the isolationism of the United States was, according to the President, a great error now ended. But passing from one extreme to the other, it was a permanent system of intervention that he intended to institute by international law. In his opinion, a four-power directorate - America,

2. Ibid., pp. 84-85.
3. Ibid., p. 369; Cf. Liggio, "Isolationism, Old and New Part I," LEFT AND RIGHT (Winter, 1966), pp. 19-35.
4. Lukacs, pp. 45, 369-370.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Soviet Russia, China and Great Britain - should settle the world's problems. ...such an organization, according to him, would have to involve the installation of American forces on bases distributed throughout the world, some of which would be located in French territory. Roosevelt thus intended to lure the Soviets into a group that would contain their ambitions and in which America could unite its dependents. Among the 'four,' he knew, in fact, that Chiang Kai-shek's China needed his cooperation and that the British, in danger of losing their dominions, would yield to his policy. ...the support offered by Washington and the existence of American bases would give rise to new sovereignties in Africa, Asia and Australasia, which would increase the number of states under an obligation to the United States.[5]

De Gaulle concluded by noting that given this limitless global domination by the United States, it was possible to satisfy the limited, defensive needs of the Soviet Union that there be no hostile regimes in Eastern Europe; in fact, as Churchill noted at the time, the recognition of Russia's interest in that region was a perfect way to distract Russia from the areas of the world which were of greater importance to Western imperialism.

Yet the Truman Administration determined to impose Western imperialism's aims upon Eastern Europe as well as on the rest of the world. As the author of The Great Powers and Eastern Europe, Lukacs is especially knowledgeable in Soviet-American relations in Eastern Europe. He concludes that the Soviet Union had made no attempt to interfere with America's new domination of Western Europe.

> Now Stalin did not particularly contest American power: he did not challenge America's sphere; did it not seem to him, however, that the Americans were beginning to challenge his sphere?[6]

The Truman Administration had difficulty in rousing the American people to the Cold War crusade. The American people knew that more than six million Russians had been killed and the major industrial, agricultural and cultural regions destroyed by the war. Americans recognized that only "two of every thousand Americans" had had to die in the war because "fifty out of

5. John Lukacs, Decline and Rise of Europe (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1965), pp. 208-209.
6. Lukacs, A New History of the Cold War, p. 81.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every thousand Russians" had died. It was remembered that "the massive bulk of this (American) aid did not reach Russia until after the Battles of Moscow and Stalingrad" when the tide of war had already been reversed, and that for every enemy division facing the Western allies there were three against the Russians. These facts were reinforced by distrust of Western imperialism "felt by Left-wing Democrats as well as by Right-wing Republicans." Furthermore, Lukacs adds, "the inchoate but deep and widespread inclinations of American isolationism had not yet been spent."[7] To overcome this opposition to the Cold War the Truman Administration called in the Old World to redress the balance of the New. From Winston Churchill to escapees from war crimes trials, the American people were deluged with propaganda totally lacking in the legitimacy of native birth.

The collapse of the Old Regime in Eastern Europe threw up on America's shores an intellectual Iron Guard to reinforce the US' administration's position vis a vis the American people. Lukacs distinguishes in American politics two main traditions: The Redskins and the Palefaces. This concept is transposed to ideology from one long familiar in American literature. The political Redskins, the mass of the American people, came here to flee the feudal systems of the old world to seek freedom from taxes, inspection, control, 'education,' conscription and foreign wars. The Redskin culture is an accumulation of individual decisions, individual desires, individual purposes which conflict with any imposition of grandiose organized schemes. The Redskin, the American, does not wish to be ruled, ordered, taxed or conscripted, but his flight from feudalism has meant a failure to confront the issue of domination by the Palefaces. The Redskins have not yet purged themselves fully by revolutionary experiences of the mentality of the emancipated slave or serf. Thus, the Redskins suffer from disunity and their leadership tends to be prophetic, lacking in the organizational talents necessary to lead a sustained assault on the citadels of privilege and monopoly, the "bureaucratic Welfare State" which the Redskins' weakness has allowed the Palefaces to construct.

The Palefaces represent those who seek to emulate the aristocratic society of Europe, that is, the ways of feuda-

7. Ibid., pp. 4, 38, 46, 62. Cf. Garet Garrett, "The American Empire," LEFT AND RIGHT (Winter, 1966), pp. 36-53.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lism upon which the European ruling classes are based. Thus, the American Palefaces have viewed themselves as a divinely chosen elite who must paternalistically direct, educate and especially control the mass of the American people, the Redskins. To the Palefaces, the Redskins have no sense of the responsibilities and sacrifices outside their natural surroundings which the Palefaces' nation-state's call to greatness entails; thus, to Palefaces the Redskins appear 'uncivilized,' 'uncultured,' and 'uneducated.' For their role in the feudal system of being guides and guards, leaders and teachers, the Palefaces insist upon a sizable part of the productivity of the Redskins. The Redskins' self-interest must be curbed, according to the Palefaces, by their own devotion to the 'common good,' the 'general welfare,' or the 'national interest.' With this rationale, the Palefaces' ultimate role is the administrator-the inspector, the public school teacher, the welfare worker, the tax-collector, the policeman, the army officer. Lukacs asks

> whether the very organization of our societies, too, is not unconsciously moving in a "rightist" direction, away from Capitalism toward older, medieval institutions. Consider only the movement away from money economy, the dependence of the citizen's position not upon birth or wealth but upon his function: a status rather than a contract society, and so forth.[8]

Capitalism has been historically the polar opposite of the Right. Capitalism, freedom, the Left, have challenged feudalism, restriction and status, the right, with all other possible positions falling between these poles. Capitalism, the self-determination of people to decide their own priorities, is precluded by the Palefaces' feudal commercial system of mercantilism or state 'capitalism'. The "rightist" direction, away from Capitalism," has subjected Americans, the Redskins, to the Palefaces' monopoly 'capitalism' or to "government intervention and to the extension of socialist patterns of life and thought."[9] The feudal nature of American statism is best seen in the major instrumentality of Paleface administration - the draft. Control of people's labor is an important element of feudalism, and it is control of people's labor that is the major goal of the Palefaces. Defense Secretary McNamara recently made the 'enlightened' proposal in the face of the popular, Redskin, opposition to conscription, that a system of

8. Lukacs, A New History of the Cold War, pp. 402-13.
9. Ibid., p. 296.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two-year national service for all youth be instituted. That is, a confiscation of two years' labor from most American citizens. Thus, in the tradition of feudalism, the rulers will have an expendable, cheap, and especially dependent (unprotected by the civil laws and subject to military and administrative slave codes) labor force. The term-of-years rather than permanent subjection is not alien to feudal institutions; indentured servitude and apprenticeship systems are refinements of the feudal system applied to advanced and complex economic relationships. The government, or to speak plainly, the Pentagon, is the largest consumer of capital and of labor in the country; compared to the Pentagon, all major industrial concerns fall to middle rank category where their profit margins are threatened by the rising firms associated with the Pentagon contract system. "United States industrialists in the name of Free Enterprise clamor for more and more government orders for their own enterprises."[10]

> Thus the United States, now the leader of the Free world, was ahead of the world in bureaucratization. This is an alarming development. ...Just as government, with its cancerously growing number of civil servants (and the less visible but more ominous growth of the number of people indirectly and partly employed by the government), suggests the transformation from the Legislative to the Administrative State, similar developments have taken place in every kind of enterprise and in wide areas of American life. The administrator rather than the producer has become the typical (and respected) American occupation.[11]

The Palefaces' administrator-orientation has been expanded from domestic feudal-paternalism to foreign imperialist-paternalism "of the White Man's Burden, of Liberation, of International Policemanship."[12] With the dominance of the Right, the Palefaces, in the American government, twentieth century American foreign policy has been imperialistic, whether by T. or F. Roosevelt, Wilson or Truman, Eisenhower or Kennedy: "these Presidents were imperialists, imperialists of a new sort, covering up their concepts of national ambitions with high-flown moralistic oratory, eminently successful imperialists of a new kind."[13] The state nationalism at

10. Ibid., p. 298.
11. Ibid., pp. 294-95.
12. Ibid., p. 339.
13. Ibid., p. 371.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the root of imperialism was the dominant ideology during the early modern period until challenged from the Left by the patriotism of the democratic revolutions, based upon Rousseau's conception of human happiness lying in the natural institutions outside the state. To the revolutionary impulse of freedom, the statist or Rightist responded; "in the early nineteenth century, the state is put forward by certain German thinkers as a majestic end in itself."[14] The Palefaces' nationalism, or state consciousness, is loyalty to the state, disregarding and often conflicting with the natural institutions, the traditions, and the specific locality of the people. The Redskins, patriotism, nation (patrie)-consciousness, is loyalty to the natural institutions, the specific locality and the traditions of the people. Thus, imperialism especially conflicts with the traditions of the mass of the American people, the Redskins. Lukacs notes the effects of the development of "an imperial society" based upon the "American world empire:"

> here I am concerned with the effects of this world-wide transformation on American society. For this involved -- and it still involves -- great radical departures from previous American traditions. Together with the development of a welfare state, the bureaucracy of the American government increased in tremendous proportions. The proportionate increase of the personnel and of the powers of federal investigative and intelligence agencies was even greater.[15]

As Lukacs indicates, the FBI and the CIA are the two Paleface instrumentalities furthest removed from the traditional freedom of the American, the Redskin; they are direct transplants from European state nationalism. As typified in Nazi Germany, state nationalism was anti-patriotic, anti-communist and anti-tradition. Thus, in twentieth century Europe, 'National', designating expansionist, anti-patriotic, anti-communist movements, "became a byword for anti-patriotic treachery during the Second World War. This tendency is faintly discernible even in the United States (cf. the McCarthyite, pro-German and sometimes mildly pro-Fascist National Review)."[16]

The anti-patriotism and anti-freedom traditions of the Palefaces have been infused with new reserves from European feudalism since World War II. Having failed in

14. Lukacs, Decline and Rise of Europe, p. 149.
15. Lukacs, A New History of the Cold War, pp. 161-63.
16. Lukacs, Decline and Rise of Europe, p. 159.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe with their anti-patriotic, anti-communist, and expansionist state nationalism, these strategic advisers have crossed over to America for one last gamble to prove their discredited theories.

> It may be symbolic that among the myriad Experts of International Relations who have been berating and advising the American people ever since the beginning of the last World War, Americanized immigrant professors have played a large role: they have fashioned, defined, and proposed new kinds of American National interests, of an atomic Realpolitik tailored to what they state are America's needs. Before me lies one of these incantations by a Director of a Foreign Policy Research Institute, consultant to the Government and Pentagon: "For the next fifty years or so, the future belongs to America. The American empire and mankind will not be opposites but merely two names for the universal order under peace and happiness. Novus orbis terrarum." I regard this kind of thing not merely pompous but impertinent.[17]

These European emigre Foreign Policy advisors have become the intellectual vanguard in the State Department, Pentagon and universities for the Paleface Establishment. So far removed are these émigrés from the American, the Redskin, traditions that irony is too weak a word to describe the transferral, the betrayal, involved when these men are appointed the judges of "Un-American" activities. Lukacs notes that "Americanism" had originally meant the instruction of immigrants in traditional American thought; but the "Un-American" activities committees have immigrants teaching their defeated feudal concepts to native-born Americans!

These Paleface emigres have escaped the judgment of the tribunals of their Redskin compatriots; since their state nationalism was allied with the imperialism of the Western Palefaces, the patriotic and traditional Redskin movements in their countries adopted the methods of communism to achieve liberation from Paleface dominion. Lukacs describes the Bolshevik Revolution as essentially a patriotic or isolationist movement which Lenin led to success: "the great and dreadful disgust of the Russian people with the European war, with Russia's Western allies, including her own cosmopolitan and Francophile aristocracy."[18] Bolshevism was the modern Russian Redskin or isolationist (Slavophile or Eurasian) tra-

17. Lukacs, A New History of the Cold War, p. 380.
18. Lukacs, Decline and Rise of Europe, p. 193.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dition against the aristocratic Palefaces or Westernizers allied with Western imperialism. Thus, the Bolsheviks moved the capital from western St. Petersburg to Moscow in the interior. The same Paleface accusation of 'agent of a foreign power' hurled against the isolationists, the Redskin patriots, Debs, Senator LaFollette, and Congressman Lindbergh, was used by the Russian Palefaces against Lenin. Although Marx himself neglected the importance of the nation as opposed to the state, Lukacs indicates that contemporary communism is a system of achieving patriotic revolutions rather than a philosophical or economic theory, as the careers of Lenin, Mao, Ho Chi Minh and Castro well illustrate; Lukacs says: "A political Marxist, such as Castro, for example, declared himself to be pro-Communist because he was anti-American, and not the reverse."[19]

Cuban resistance to American imperialism is a major subject added to this revised New History of the Cold War. The Cuban Revolution was already over a year old when the first edition of the book was written. As in the case of such few perceptive historians of American foreign relations as William Appleman Williams (Tragedy of American Diplomacy) and John Gerassi (Great Fear in Latin America), Lukacs notes that nationalist movements tend to take on the ideological structure of the major opponents of Western imperialism - fascism before 1945, communism since. Cuba's communism is the consequence of Cuban nationalism's opposition to American domination; Castro adopted Marxism-Leninism as the leading philosophy of irreconcilability with American imperialism and to force the Soviet Union to protect Cuba against American military interventions after 1960. Lukacs is unequivocal in placing the blame for the October 1962 Missile Crisis upon the United States:

> It was this threat of an American invasion and not the so-called Rocket Confrontation which culminated in the fantastic American-Russian crisis over Cuba in October 1962: the former led to the latter and not, as it is commonly believed, the reverse.[20]

The Soviet installation of medium rockets in Cuba is explained as a cautious, defensive move to prevent a widely expected American invasion of Cuba and to stabilize American-Soviet relations. With the discovery of the missile sites, built "in an ostentatious manner, without any attempt to conceal or disguise them," serious negotiations

---

19. Ibid., p. 193.
20. Lukacs, A New History of the Cold War, p. 237.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

led to their dismantlement in exchange for the major American commitment not to invade Cuba, and the minor one of removing American missile bases against Russia in Turkey and Italy. As the Soviets had hoped, the concrete solution of the crisis led to a detente between Russia and America, exemplified by the nuclear test ban treaty and by the wheat agreement. On June 10, 1963 at American University, Kennedy made what Lukacs calls "the most significant speech of his career"; he spoke out against a military and foreign policy of a "Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war."[21] This was succeeded by initiatives in various areas of the world. A new policy reducing the American hostility toward China was about to be launched, along with the actual withdrawal of American troops in Vietnam preceding a negotiated settlement between the anti-Diem Junta and the National Liberation Front. Finally, restoration of amicable relations with Cuba was projected by Kennedy in a Miami speech of November 18, 1963, just four days before his assassination.[22]

A major new contribution by Lukacs is his treatment of the meaning of the 1964 elections. Johnson's electoral mandate was based upon an essentially isolationist program. Johnson's interests drew him toward domestic affairs away from international involvements. "True, this characteristic was inseparable from a certain parochialness of his views," but it was suitable since America "would do well to embark on a policy of broad and cautious retrenchment."[23] This American mood of isolationism was challenged by the Republican candidate who offered, as Lukacs notes, the first clear choice since the isolationist-interventionist contest of 1920; Johnson's plurality was second only to that of 1920 when isolationism also triumphed. Of course, Johnson's isolationism was a fraud and he adopted Goldwater's expansionism soon after the election had repudiated it. Lukacs doubts that Goldwater's nomination represented an increase in "American conservatism":

> It would be wrong to deduce therefrom (Goldwater's nomination) that the appeal for "American conservatism", that is, for an anti-Communist crusade, had grown during that decade; indeed, there is reason to believe that the social base of McCarthy's following was more solid than was Goldwater's.[24]

---

21. Ibid., p. 259.
22. Ibid., pp. 246-47.
23. Ibid., pp. 261-62.
24. Ibid., pp. 262-63.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This anti-communist crusading signifies "the weakness of American 'conservatism' - which is, in reality, nothing more than radical nationalism of a shallow and second-rate nature... Adlai Stevenson may be the American Mendes-France; but, mon Dieu, what do Barry Goldwater and Charles de Gaulle have in common? Nothing."[25] De Gaulle is peaceful, patriotic, traditional - isolationist; "American conservatives" are expansionist, anti-patriotic, anti-communist - "National".

Involved in these matters is the civil rights revolution. Negroes in the Black Belt and Black Ghettos have shared with the mass of American people an adherence to patriotic nationalism against state nationalism as represented in their localities by the public welfare workers, school teachers, police forces, etc. In the Black Belt state nationalism has been supported by such community groups as the KKK. Lukacs notes that

> in the South the demonstrations for the enforcement of the long overdue civil rights were resisted by brutal murders committed by members of the reborn Ku Klux Klan, a general sense of malaise appeared in many manifestations of American life, suggesting that the problems of this great people were deeper and more widespread than it has been generally believed; that perhaps it was not only the lack of world historical experience but also the superficiality of domestic cohesiveness which might eventually reduce that American role of world leadership...[26]

Yet, the weaknesses of the domestic foundations of American imperialism have been matched by increasingly wilder gambles on the international scene, especially in Asia. Lukacs indicates that "today that portion of the Russo-Chinese frontier is still along the Amur" where it was fixed by treaty in 1689; in contrast, while Boston and New York were experiencing the English Glorious Revolution, "in 1689 the American frontier was but a few dozen miles inland from the Atlantic coast; today the American flag flies in Okinawa, Japan, Korea, across the Pacific everywhere and even on the Asian mainland."[27] On the Asian mainland, it was in relation to China that American expansion was most clearly evident after 1945, as it had been before; and Chiang's interest remained paramount, dragging the American people into the Cold War just as his interest had led to Pearl Harbor.

---

25. Lukacs, Decline and Rise of Europe, p. 262.
26. Lukacs, A New History of the Cold War, p. 263.
27. Ibid., p. 12.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> American marines, and naval units helped to ferry advanced troops of the Nationalist government up North to establish their authority after the Japanese surrender... after all is said, the Russians did evacuate Manchuria by late 1946, turning its cities over not to Communist but to Chinese Nationalist garrisons. Russian support to the Chinese Communists cannot be denied; but, on the other hand, this support was far less than American supplies to the Nationalists during the same period... Stalin's support of Mao was halfhearted. Remembering the occasional enthusiasm of certain American officials for Mao during the war, until mid-1947 the Russians feared that the Chinese Communists would be unduly close to the United States. This was at least one of the principal reasons why Moscow refused to break relations with Chiang's regime even as late as 1948.[28]

Lukacs' discussion of the American intervention in Korea seems relevant to today's events; the inability of modern warfare to defeat popular Asian forces was evident despite the "undisputed superiority of American air power during the first phase of the war." [29]

> The relative victor of the Korean War was not Russia but China; but her victory was one of prestige rather than of power...[30]

Checked in its crusade against China from the northern gateway, Korea, which Japan had used to invade China, the Pentagon shifted to the alternative route which Japan had also adopted, Vietnam.

> American military and political influence was already superseding the French in southern Indochina when the Dien Bien Phu crisis broke... and in view of the experience of the Korean war, it is strange how Dulles and Admiral Radford could believe that the intervention of American air power alone could turn the tide of this guerrilla war fought in millet fields and rice paddies.[31]

Lukacs sketches the American intervention in Vietnam from its encouragement of Diem to violate the Geneva Agreement's election terms "since they feared that they would lose such an election to Ho Chi Minh", to the United

---

28. Ibid., pp. 90-91.
29. Ibid., p. 96.
30. Ibid., p. 102.
31. Ibid., p. 118.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States' escalation of the Vietnam War in 1965, which Lukacs notes

> did not at all mean that the Americans could do what the French had been unable to do more than a decade earlier: to defeat the Vietcong in the field and to eliminate the guerrilla warfare altogether. Reasonable estimates suggested that no less than one million American soldiers were needed to do the trick - perhaps... the Indochinese situation was different from the Korean one. ...in Vietnam the North and the Vietcong proved to be a match for the Americans without having to depend on the Chinese for their survival... (In Korea) there is every reason to believe that the aerial bombing of Manchuria would have led nowhere. Unfortunately there was little to suggest that Dean Rusk in 1964-65 understood these historical distinctions better than had his predecessor, the other Dean (Acheson), exactly fifteen years earlier; and it seems, too, that Johnson was not sufficiently aware of the singular inefficacy of strategic air power. ...like the strategic bombing of Germany during the last world war, or like the American air superiority during the first phase of the Korean War, this produced no worthwhile effects at all. ...the wooden diplomacy of Dean Rusk deserves most criticism: for, given the by now undoubtedly impressive endurance of the Vietcong and of the Ho Chi Minh regime in the North, it seems that even in the not too likely event of a decisive American victory in the South the Americans' present adversaries may have earned their rights to become virtually the principal power in Indochina in the long run.[32]

Lukacs wonders how many Americans, Left or Right, will consider Vietnam worth the bones of a single US marine. One is reminded of Bismarck's warning on December 5, 1876 during a major crisis between the Great Powers in the newly emerging countries of the Balkans: "They are not worth the healthy bones of a single Pomeranian grenadier." Bismarck and Eisenhower had the sense to stay the hands of the military from engaging in the loss of their people's lives. Bismarck's successors, as well as Johnson, lacked that discretion and have been marked in the ledger of history as war-criminals, as much for what they did to their own people as for the suffering they inflicted upon others.

---

32. Ibid., pp. 267-71.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED